



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,535	09/30/2003	David W. Farchmin	110003.00051.03AB206	6083

7590 11/02/2006

Susan M. Donahue
Rockwell Automation, Inc. 704-P
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

NORTON, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/675,535	Applicant(s) FARCHMIN, DAVID W.	
	Examiner Jennifer L. Norton	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2006.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 and 48-70 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 and 48-70 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/31/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a **Final Office Action** in response to the Amendment received on 11 August 2006. Claim 57 has been amended. Claims 1-46 and 48-70 are pending in this application.

Drawings

2. The amendment to the Specification was received on 11 August 2006. The correction is acceptable and the objection to the Drawings is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. The amendment to the Claims was received on 11 August 2006. The correction is acceptable and the objection to Claim 57 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-26, 28-33, 35-42, 44, 48, 50-51 and 54-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0021158 (hereinafter De Meyer).

6. As per claim 1, De Meyer discloses an apparatus for use in an automated environment including at least a first automated assembly including a plurality of components that facilitate an automated process, at least one portable wireless information device (WID) and a controller for controlling the assembly, the apparatus comprising:

a first component (pg. 5, par. [0052] and Fig. 11, element AP1) that is one of the plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051]) and that is linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030] and Fig. 11, element CS) to facilitate at least a sub-process associated with the automated process (pg. 2, par. [0016] and pg. 7, par. [0071]), the first component including at least a first wireless receiver (pg. 3, par. [0025], i.e. receiver) for receiving wireless signals from the at least one WID (pg. 3, par. [0026], pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element MU); and

a processor (Fig. 11, element CS) receiving signals from the first receiver and running location determining software for determining the location of the at least one WID as a function of the signals received therefrom (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

7. As per claim 2, De Meyer discloses the first component is a stationary human-machine interface (HMI) device (pg. 3, par. [0024]).
8. As per claim 3, De Meyer discloses at least one of the automated assembly components includes a mounting surface accessible within the environment and proximate the automated assembly and wherein the HMI is mounted to the mounting surface (pg. 3, par. [0024]).
9. As per claim 5, De Meyer discloses the HMI includes the processor (Fig. 1, element CS) for determining location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).
10. As per claim 7, De Meyer discloses the first component (Fig. 11, element AP) is linked to the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) via a communication network and is also linked to the processor via the communication network (pg. 3, par. [0028], pg. 4, par. [0041] and pg. 7, par. [0071]).
11. As per claim 9, De Meyer discloses the processor (Fig. 11, element CS) is part of the controller (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030], pg. 5, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element CS).

12. As per claim 11, De Meyer discloses the first receiver is juxtaposed proximate the automated assembly (pg. 3, par. [0024] and [0026] and Fig. 11, element AP5) and wherein the apparatus further includes at least a second receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077], Fig. 11, element AP6, i.e. receiving devices) positioned at a second location relative to the automated assembly (Fig. 11), the second receiver also providing received signals to the processor the processor determining WID location as a function of the signals received from each of the first and second receivers (pg. 8, par. [0077])).

13. As per claim 12, De Meyer discloses the environment includes at least a second automated assembly (Fig. 11, element OA3) controlled by the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) and including a second plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) provided to facilitate an automated process (pg. 2, par. [0016]), the apparatus further including at least a second component (Fig. 11, element AP3) that is one of the second plurality of components and that is linked to the controller (Fig. 11, element CN), the second component including the second receiver (Fig. 11, element AP3, i.e. receiving devices) for receiving signals from the at least one WID and providing the received signals to the processor (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

14. As per claim 13, De Meyer discloses each of the first and second components are human-machine interfaces (HMIs) and each is linked to the controller via a communication network (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

15. As per claim 14, De Meyer discloses the processor is embedded within the first HMI and wherein the second HMI is linked to the first HMI via the communication network (pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. HMI communication module).

16. As per claim 15, De Meyer discloses at least a third receiver ((Fig. 11, element AP4, i.e. receiving devices) positioned at a third location relative to the first and second automated assemblies for receiving signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]), the third receiver linked to the processor (Fig. 11, element CS) via the communication network (Fig. 11, element CN), the processor receiving signals from the first, second and third receivers and using the received signal to determine WID location (pg. 7, par. [0073]).

17. As per claim 16, De Meyer discloses a wireless data system (pg. 3, par. [0025] and pg. 8, par. [0077]), the data system including a plurality of access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6), each access point including a receiver (i.e. "receiving devices") and a transmitter for receiving data from and transmitting data to the at least one WID, respectively (pg. 3, par. [0025]).

18. As per claim 17, De Meyer discloses at least a sub-set of the access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6) generates location information and wherein the location

information is provided to the processor via the communication network and used by the processor to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

19. As per claim 18, De Meyer discloses a wireless data system linked to the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for transmitting data to and receiving data from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

20. As per claim 19, De Meyer discloses the wireless data system includes data receivers that are separate from the first receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6, i.e. receiving devices).

21. As per claim 20, De Meyer discloses the data system includes access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6), each access point including one of the data receivers (pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. "receiving devices") and also including a data transmitter (pg. 3, par. [0025]), information received by at least a sub-set of the data receivers provided to the processor (pg. 8, par. [0077]), the processor (Fig. 11, element CS) using the information from the sub-set of data receivers and the first receiver to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. 0077)).

22. As per claim 21, De Meyer discloses the first component also includes a first transmitter for transmitting data to the at least one WID (pg. 3, par. [0025]).

23. As per claim 22, De Meyer discloses the first component includes a transmitter for wirelessly transmitting data (pg. 3, par. [0025]).

24. As per claim 23, De Meyer discloses a system comprising:

a controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for controlling an automated assembly (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]);

at least one portable wireless information device (WID) that transmits wireless signals (Fig. 11, element MU);

at least a first automated assembly (Fig. 11, element OA4) including a plurality of components that together facilitate an automated process (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051], pg. 7, par. [0071]), the plurality of components including a first component (Fig. 11, element AP5) linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller to facilitate at least a sub-process associated with the automated process (pg. 2, par. [0016] and pg. 7, par. [0071]), the first component including a wireless receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element MU); and

a processor (Fig. 11, element CS) linked to the first component for obtaining signals from the receiver and running location determining software for determining the location of the at least one WID (Fig. 11, element MU) as a function of the received signals (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

25. As per claim 24, De Meyer discloses the first component is a human-machine interface (HMI) (pg. 3, par. [0024]).

26. As per claim 25, De Meyer discloses at least one of the automated assembly components includes an accessible mounting surface and wherein the HMI is mounted to the mounting surface (pg. 3, par. [0024]).

27. As per claim 26, De Meyer discloses the HMI includes the processor (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

28. As per claim 28, De Meyer discloses the first receiver is juxtaposed proximate the automated assembly (pg. 3, par. [0024] and [0026] and Fig. 11, element AP5),

the system further including at least a second automated assembly (Fig. 11, element OA3) controlled by the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) and

including a second plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) provided to facilitate a second automated process (pg. 2, par. [0016]), the second plurality of components including at least a second component (Fig. 11, element AP3) linked to the controller to facilitate at least a sub-process associated with the second assembly (pg. 3, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element CN), the second component including a second receiver positioned proximate the second assembly (Fig.

11, element AP3, i.e. receiving devices), the second receiver providing received signals to the processor, the processor determining WID location as a function of signals received from each of the first and second receivers (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

29. As per claim 29, De Meyer discloses each of the first and second components are human-machine interfaces (HMIs) (pg. 3, par. [0024]).

30. As per claim 30, De Meyer discloses the processor is embedded within the first component (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

31. As per claim 31, De Meyer discloses a location determining assembly for use in an automated environment including at least a first automated assembly (Fig. 11, OA4) including components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) that facilitate an automated process (pg. 2, par. [0016]), at least one portable wireless information device (WID) (pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element MU) and a controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for controlling the assembly (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]), the assembly comprising: a first human-machine interface (HMI) (Fig. 11, element AP5) associated with the first automated assembly (pg. 5, par. [0052] and pg. 8, par. [0077]) and linked to the controller via a communication network (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030] and Fig. 11, element CN) for at least one of providing information thereto and receiving information therefrom, the HMI including a first wireless receiver (pg. 8,

par. [0077], i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving wireless signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element MU); and a processor (Fig. 11, element CS) receiving signals from the receiver and running location determining software for determining the location of the at least one WID as a function of the signals received therefrom (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

32. As per claim 32, De Meyer discloses the environment further includes at least a second automated assembly (pg. 2, par. [0016] and Fig. 11, element OA3) controlled by the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) and wherein the assembly further includes a second HMI (Fig. 11, element AP3) associated with the second automated assembly (pg. 5, par. [0052] and pg. 8, par. [0077]) and linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) to at least one of provide information thereto and receive information therefrom (pg. 8, par. [0077]), the second HMI including a second wireless receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving wireless signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element MU), the processor (Fig. 11, element CS) receiving signals from each of the first and second receivers and determining WID location as a function of the received signals (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

33. As per claim 33, De Meyer discloses the processor is embedded within the first HMI (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

34. As per claim 35, De Meyer discloses the processor provides WID location determination information to the controller and the controller uses the location information to perform a location dependent function (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

35. As per claim 36, De Meyer discloses the location dependent function includes one of providing location dependent information to the at least one WID and modifying control of the automated assembly (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

36. As per claim 37, De Meyer discloses a system for use in an automated environment including at least first and second automated assemblies (pg. 2, par. [0016], pg. 7, par. [0071], and Fig. 11, element OA3 and OA4) for performing first and second automated processes (pg. 5, par. [0052] and pg. 8, par. [0077]), at least one portable wireless information device (WID) (Fig. 11, element MU) and a controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for controlling the assemblies (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]), the system comprising: a wireless data communication system linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller and for transmitting data to and receiving data from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]); a first human-machine interface (HMI) (Fig. 11, element AP5) linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller to facilitate at least a sub-process associated with the first automated process (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]) and including a first receiver for receiving signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par.

[0077], i.e. "receiving devices"), the first HMI positioned proximate the first automated assembly (pg. 3, par. [0024]) for at least one of providing information related thereto and receiving control instructions there for (pgs. 2-3, par. [0016] and [0022]); a second human-machine interface (HMI) (Fig. 11, element AP3) linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) to facilitate at least a sub-process associated with the second automated process (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]) and including a second receiver (i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element MU), the second HMI positioned proximate (pg. 3, par. [0024]) the second automated assembly for at least one of providing information related thereto and receiving control instructions there for (pgs. 2-3, par. [0016] and [0022]); and a processor (Fig. 11, element CS) receiving signals from the first and second receivers and running location determining software for determining the location of the at least one WID (Fig. 11, element MU) as a function of the signals received therefrom (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

37. As per claim 38, De Meyer discloses the wireless communication system (pg. 3, par. [0025] and pg. 8, par. [0077]) includes a plurality of access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6).

38. As per claim 39, De Meyer discloses the system of claim 37 wherein the processor is embedded in the first HMI (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

39. As per claim 40, De Meyer discloses a method for use in an automated environment including at least a first automated assembly (pg. 2, par. [0016], pg. 7, par. [0071], and Fig. 11, element OA4), at least one portable wireless information device (WID) (Fig. 11, element MU) and a controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for controlling the assembly (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]), the assembly including a plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) provided to facilitate an automated assembly process (pg. 2, par. [0016], pg. 7, par. [0071], and Fig. 11, element OA4), the plurality of components including a first component (Fig. 11, element AP5) linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller to facilitate an assembly sub-process (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]), the method comprising the steps of: equipping the first component (Fig. 11, element AP5) with a wireless receiver (i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving wireless signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]); receiving WID signals via the receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077]); and using the received signals to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

40. As per claim 41, De Meyer discloses the first component is a human machine interface (HMI) (Fig. 11, element AP5) and wherein the step of equipping includes embedding the receiver (i.e. receiving devices) in the HMI (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

41. As per claim 42, De Meyer discloses at least one of the automated assembly components includes a mounting surface accessible within the environment and proximate the automated assembly and wherein the method further includes the step of mounting the HMI to the mounting surface (pg. 3, par. [0024]).

42. As per claim 44, De Meyer discloses the step of using the received signals includes providing a processor as part of the HMI and using the processor to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

43. As per claim 48, De Meyer discloses the environment includes at least a second automated assembly (pg. 2, par. [0016], pg. 7, par. [0071], and Fig. 11, element OA3) controlled by the controller (Fig. 11, element CS), the second assembly including a plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) provided to facilitate a second automated assembly process (pg. 5, par. [0052] and pg. 8, par. [0077]), the plurality of components including a second component (Fig. 11, element AP3) linked (Fig. 11, element CN) to the controller (Fig. 11, element CS) to facilitate an assembly sub-process (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]), the method further including equipping the second component with a second receiver (i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving WID signals (pg. 8, par. [0077]), the step of receiving including receiving signals from each of the first and second receivers and the step of using the

received signals to determine WID location including using the signals from each of the first and second receivers (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

44. As per claim 50, De Meyer discloses the step of using includes providing a processor (Fig. 11, element CS), linking the processor to the first component via a communication network (pg. 7, par. [0071] and pg. 8, par. [0077] and Fig. 11, element CN), transmitting the receiver signals (i.e. "receiving devices") via the communication network to the processor and performing an algorithm via the processor to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

45. As per claim 51, De Meyer discloses the step of linking additional receivers (i.e. "receiving devices") to the processor (Fig. 11, element CS), obtaining additional WID signals (Fig. 11, element AP3R-AP6R) via the additional receivers and providing the additional WID signals to the processor via the communication network, the step of using further including using at least a sub-set of the signals received from each of the receivers to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

46. As per claim 54, De Meyer discloses a system for use in an automated environment including a plurality of automated assemblies (Fig. 11, element OA3 and OA4), each assembly including components that facilitate automated processes and at least one portable wireless information device (WID) (Fig. 11, element MU), the system

Art Unit: 2121

comprising: at least a first processor (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030] and Fig. 11, element CS); a set of communication access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6) configured to receive signals from, and transmit signals to, the WID (pg. 3, par. [0025] and pg. 8, par. [0077]; a set of wireless receivers (i.e. "receiving devices"), each wireless receiver integrated with a different component from a first sub-set of the assembly components and configured to receive signals from the WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]); and at least a first communication network (Fig. 11, element CN) linking at least a sub-set of the first subset component to the at least one processor and also linking each access point to the at least one processor (pg. 7, par. [0071]), the at least one processor obtaining WID signals from each of the receivers and also at least one of transmitting signals to, and receiving signals from, each of the first sub-set assembly components, via the at least a first network (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

47. As per claim 55, De Meyer discloses at least a sub-set of the first sub-set of the assembly components (pg. 1, par. [0009] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) includes human-machine interfaces (HMIs) (Fig. 11, element AP5).

48. As per claim 56, De Meyer discloses at least one processor (Fig. 11, element CS) both transmits signals to and receives signals from at least a sub-set of the first sub-set of assembly components via the network (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030] and pg. 8, par. [0077]).

49. As per claim 57, De Meyer discloses at least one processor (Fig. 11, element CS) uses the obtained WID signals to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

50. As per claim 58, De Meyer discloses the processor (Fig. 11, element CS) also uses WID signals received from at least a sub-set of the communication access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6) to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

51. As per claim 59, De Meyer discloses at least one processor (Fig. 11, element CS) includes at least a first processor (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]) linked via the at least a first network (Fig. 11, element CN) to the access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6) and at least a second processor (pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. "HMI communication module") linked via the at least a first network (Fig. 11, element CN) to the first sub-set of assembly components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) and wherein the at least a first network links the first and second processors together (pg. 7, par. [0071]).

52. As per claim 60, De Meyer discloses the first sub-set of assembly components (Fig. 11, element OA4) includes a first component (Fig. 11, element AP5) and wherein the second processor is integrated into the first component (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

53. As per claim 61, De Meyer discloses at least the first component is a human-machine interface (HMI) (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 7, par. [0071]) and Fig. 11, element AP5).

54. As per claim 62, De Meyer discloses at least a first network (Fig. 11, element CN) includes at least a first network (Fig. 11, element CN) that links the communication access points (Fig. 11, element AP3-AP6) to the first processor (pg. 7, par. [0071]) and at least a second network that links the first sub-set assembly components to the second processor (pg. 1, par. [0006], pg. 3, par. [0024] and pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. "HMI communication module").

55. As per claim 63, De Meyer discloses at least a first processor (Fig. 11, element CS) is remotely (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]) located from the first sub-set assembly components (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

56. As per claim 64, De Meyer discloses a method for use in an automated environment including a plurality of automated assemblies (pg. 2, par. [0016], pg. 7, par. [0071], pg. 8, par. [0077], and Fig. 11, element OA3 and OA4), at least one portable wireless information device (WID) (Fig. 11, element MU) and at least one controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for controlling the assemblies (pg. 3, par. [0028] and [0030]), each assembly including a plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4,

par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) provided to facilitate an automated assembly process (pg. 2, par. [0016] and pg. 7, par. [0071]), at least a first sub-set of the assembly components linked to the controller (Fig. 11, element CN) to at least one of provide signals thereto or receive signals therefrom (pgs. 2-3, par. [0016] and [0022]) and pg. 8, par. [0077]), the method comprising the steps of: equipping at least a sub-set of the first sub-set of assembly components with wireless receivers (i.e. "receiving devices") for receiving wireless signals from the at least one WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]); receiving WID signals via the receivers (pg. 8, par. [0077]); and using at least a sub-set of the received signals to determine WID location (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

57. As per claim 65, De Meyer discloses at least a sub-set of the first sub-set (Fig. 11, element OA4) includes human-machine interfaces (Fig. 11, element AP5 and AP6) and wherein the step of equipping includes embedding receivers (i.e. "receiving devices") in the assembly components (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

58. As per claim 66, De Meyer discloses a system for use in an automated environment including at least a first automated assembly (pg. 2, par. [0016], pg. 7, par. [0071], pg. 8, par. [0077], and Fig. 11, element OA3 and OA4) including a plurality of components (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 4, par. [0051] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) that facilitate an automated process (pg. 2, par. [0016] and pg. 7, par. [0071]) and a controller (Fig. 11, element CS) for controlling the assembly (pg. 3, par. [0028] and

[0030]), the system comprising: at least a first wireless information device (WID) (Fig. 11, element MU) including a transceiver (pg. 3, par. [0025]) and a first processor (Fig. 11, element CS); a first component (Fig. 11, element AP5) that is one of the plurality of components that is linked to the controller (pg. 7, par. [0071] and Fig. 11, element CN) to facilitate at least a sub-process associated with the automated process (pg. 8, par. [0077]), the first component including at least a first wireless transmitter for transmitting wireless signals to the at least one WID (pg. 3, par. [0025]); at least one receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077], i.e. "receiving devices"); and at least a second processor linked to the first component (pg. 8, par. [0077], element "HMI communication module") and to the at least one receiver, the at least a second processor running a program to determine WID position as a function of signal strength data generated by the transmitter and the WID (pg. 8, par. [0077]); wherein, the at least a first transmitter transmits signals of known signal strength to the WID (pg. 3, par. [0025]), the WID determines signal strengths and transmits signal strength data to the at least one receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077]) and the at least a second processor (Fig. 11, element AP5) obtains the signal strength data from the at least one receiver and uses the obtained data to determine WID position (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

59. As per claim 67, De Meyer discloses at least a first component (Fig. 11, element AP5) includes a plurality of components (pg. 3, par. [0025] and pg. 8, par. [0077]), each of the plurality including a separate transmitter (pg. 3, par. [0025]) and, wherein,

Art Unit: 2121

the WID receives signals from at least a sub-set of the transmitters (pg. 3, par. [0025]), determines signal strength and transmits the signal strength data to the receiver (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

60. As per claim 68, De Meyer discloses at least one receiver is separate from the at least one component (pg. 7, par. [0071] and pg. 8, par. [0077]).

61. As per claim 69, De Meyer discloses at least one receiver (i.e. "receiving devices") is a communication access point that is part of a wireless communication network (pg. 8, par. [0077]).

62. As per claim 70, De Meyer discloses at least one component is a human-machine interface (pg. 1, par. [0009], pg. 7, par. [0071] and Fig. 11, element AP5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

63. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

64. Claims 4, 6, 10, 27, 34, 43, 45-46, 49 and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Meyer in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0234741 (hereinafter Rogers).

65. As per claim 4, De Meyer does expressly teach the first receiver includes a wireless antenna.

Rogers teaches to the receiver includes a wireless antenna (pg. 3, par. [0033] and Fig. 3, element 320).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include a receiver with a wireless antenna to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

66. As per claim 6, De Meyer does not expressly teach the location determining software causes the processor to perform a statistical analysis on the received signals to determine WID location.

Rogers teaches to the location determining software causes the processor to perform a statistical analysis on the received signals to determine WID location (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include the location determining software causes the processor to perform a statistical analysis on the received signals to determine WID location to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

67. As per claim 10, De Meyer does not expressly teach the location determining software causes the processor to perform a statistical analysis on the received signals to determine WID location.

Rogers teaches a statistical analysis on the received signals to determine WID location (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include a statistical analysis on the received signals to determine WID location to enhance the

Art Unit: 2121

resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

68. As per claim 27, De Meyer does not expressly teach the location determining software causes the processor to perform at least one of a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the received signals to determine WID location.

Rogers teaches to a statistical analysis (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]) and a triangulation method (pg. 5, par. [0050] and [0054]) on the received signals to determine WID location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include at least one of a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the received signals to determine WID location to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

69. As per claim 34, De Meyer does not expressly teach the processor performs at least one of a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the received signals to determine WID location.

Rogers teaches to a statistical analysis (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]) and a triangulation method (pg. 5, par. [0050] and [0054]) on the received signals to determine WID location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include at least one of a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the received signals to determine WID location to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

70. As per claim 43, De Meyer does not expressly teach to the step of embedding includes integrating a wireless antenna with the HMI.

Rogers teaches to a wireless antenna (pg. 3, par. [0033] and Fig. 3, element 320).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include a wireless antenna to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

71. As per claim 45, De Meyer does not expressly teach the step of using the processor includes at least one of performing a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the location information received from the receiver.

Rogers teaches to a statistical analysis (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]) and a triangulation method (pg. 5, par. [0050] and [0054]) on the location information received from the receiver.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the location information received from the receiver to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

72. As per claim 46, De Meyer teaches the step of receiving additional WID signals via other receivers (i.e. "receiving devices"), providing the other received signals to the processor (Fig. 11, element CS and pg. 8, par. [0077])

De Meyer does not expressly teach to performing the statistical analysis on the received WID signals.

Rogers teaches to performing the statistical analysis on the received signals (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include performing the statistical analysis on the received signals to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

73. As per claim 49, De Meyer does not expressly teach to the step of using includes performing at least one of a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the received signals to determine WID location.

Rogers teaches to a statistical analysis (pg. 5, par. [0052] and [0055]) and a triangulation method (pg. 5, par. [0050] and [0054]) on the received signals to determine location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include performing at least one of a statistical analysis and a triangulation method on the received signals to determine location to enhance the resolution and accuracy of

Art Unit: 2121

determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

74. As per claim 52, De Meyer does not expressly teach the step of equipping includes providing a port on the first component for receiving a linkage, providing an antenna, mounting the antenna and linking the antenna to the first component port via a linkage.

Rogers teaches to a wireless antenna (pg. 3, par. [0033] and Fig. 3, element 320) Connected to a network access devices (Fig. 3, element 300).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include to a wireless antenna connected to a network access devices to enhance the resolution and accuracy of determination of the location of wireless network access point devices (pg. 3, par. [0030]).

75. As per claim 53, De Meyer teaches as set forth above the first component is a stationary human-machine interface (HMI) device (pg. 3, par. [0024]).

76. Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Meyer in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0235468 (hereinafter Luebke).

As per claim 8, De Meyer does not expressly teach the network is an Ethernet network.

Luebke teaches to an Ethernet network (pg. 3, par. [0042]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teaching of De Meyer to include to an Ethernet network to minimizes latency by providing regional network coordinator (pg. 4, par. [0051]).

Response to the Declaration

77. The Declaration filed on 11 August 2006 is ineffective to overcome the De Meyers reference in the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-26, 28-33, 35-42, 44, 48, 50-51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the De Meyers and Rogers references in the rejection of claims 4, 6, 10, 27, 34, 43, 45-46, 49 and 52-53 and the De Meyers and Luebke references in the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on 5 March 2006 because:

78. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the De Meyers reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The Applicant has failed to clearly describe:

- a. The individual claims of the instant application as they pertain to the exhibits. Hence, the applicant has not mapped the claims to the exhibits presented to the Office.
- b. Indicate a clear timeline of the conception of the instant application.
- c. Disclose all authors and pages of the document (e.g. PowerPoint Presentation). The Declaration states, "I am the primary inventor of the subject matter claimed in US patent application 10/675535..." which raises the issue are there other unlisted "secondary" inventors to the instant application.

MPEP 715.07 [R-3]:

A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. *Ex parte Saunders*, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883). Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his

or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131.

The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date (see MPEP 715.07 [R-3]). Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). *In re Borkowski*, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also *In re Harry*, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred.").

79. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the De Meyers reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. Applicant has not shown diligence accounting for the period of 21 July 2003 to 30 September 2003.

MPEP 715.07(a):

Where conception occurs prior to the date of the reference, but reduction to practice is afterward, it is not enough merely to allege that applicant or patent owner had been diligent. *Ex parte Hunter*, 1889 C.D. 218, 49 O.G. 733 (Comm'r Pat. 1889). Rather, applicant must show evidence of facts establishing diligence.

In determining the sufficiency of a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, diligence need not be considered unless conception of the invention prior to the effective date is clearly established, since diligence comes into question only after prior conception is established. *Ex parte Kantor*, 177 USPQ 455 (Bd. App. 1958).

What is meant by diligence is brought out in *Christie v. Seybold*, 1893 C.D. 515, 64 O.G. 1650 (6th Cir. 1893). In patent law, an inventor is either diligent at a given time or he is not diligent; there are no degrees of diligence. An applicant may be diligent within the meaning of the patent law when he or she is doing nothing, if his or her lack of activity is excused. Note, however, that the record must set forth an explanation or excuse for the inactivity; the USPTO or courts will not speculate on possible explanations for delay or inactivity. See *In re Nelson*, 420 F.2d 1079, 164 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1970). Diligence must be judged on the basis of the

particular facts in each case. See MPEP § 2138.06 for a detailed discussion of the diligence requirement for proving prior invention.

Under 37 CFR 1.131, the critical period in which diligence must be shown begins just prior to the effective date of the reference or activity and ends with the date of a reduction to practice, either actual or constructive (i.e., filing a United States patent application). Note, therefore, that only diligence before reduction to practice is a material consideration. The "lapse of time between the completion or reduction to practice of an invention and the filing of an application thereon" is not relevant to an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. See *Ex parte Merz*, 75 USPQ 296 (Bd. App. 1947).

80. As per claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 27, 34, 43, 45-46, 49 and 52-53 rejected under the 35 U.S.C 103(a), the Applicant is required to swear behind the combination of prior art, not only the primary prior art reference (i.e. De Meyers).

MPEP 715.02:

Applicant may overcome a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection based on a combination of references by showing completion of the invention by applicant prior to the effective date of any of the references; applicant need not antedate the reference with the earliest filing date. However, as discussed above, applicant's 37 CFR 1.131

affidavit must show possession of either the whole invention as claimed or something falling within the claim(s) prior to the effective date of the reference being antedated; it is not enough merely to show possession of what the reference happens to show if the reference does not teach the basic inventive concept.

Where a claim has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Reference A in view of Reference B, with the effective date of secondary Reference B being earlier than that of Reference A, the applicant can rely on the teachings of Reference B to show that the differences between what is shown in his or her 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art prior to the date of Reference A. However, the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must still establish possession of the claimed invention, not just what Reference A shows, if Reference A does not teach the basic inventive concept.

81. The Declaration does not specify whether the document is a 1.131 or 1.312 Declaration.

Response to Arguments

82. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pgs. 21-22, filed 11 August 2006 with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-26, 28-33, 35-42, 44, 48, 50-51 and 54-70 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

83. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "second processor that is separate from the WID") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

84. As per claim 66, applicant's argument that the prior art fails to teach "the WID generates the signal strength", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

De Meyers discloses (pg. 8, par. [0076]) "In the exemplary embodiment of FIG. 8, the mobile control and monitoring module MU receives and analyzes, in a first step, short-range fields so as to determine the position of the module MU. These short-range fields are, in particular, emission signals of neighboring HMI communications modules. In FIG. 8, these emission signals are, for example, emission signals AP5S,

AP6S of the third and fourth HMI communications module AP5, AP6, in particular field strengths emitted therefrom.”

(pg. 8, par. [0077]) “... emissions MUS of the mobile control and monitoring module MU are received, in a first step, by neighboring HMI communications modules, e.g., the modules AP5, AP6, and are analyzed to determine the position of the mobile control and monitoring module MU. The receiving devices in the HMI communications modules that are required for this purpose are configured, e.g., as GSM, GPRS or WLAN transmitting and receiving devices. The position is then determined by analyzing these emissions, either in an HMI communications module or in the central server.”

Hence, the De Meyer discloses that the short-range fields/emission signals are field strengths that are determined by the WID (i.e. MU) from HMIs and sent to the second processor (i.e. HMI) for analyzing to determine the position. Therefore, De Meyer meets the limitations of claim 66.

85. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pg. 22, filed 11 August 2006 with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 27, 34, 43, 45-46, 49 and 52-53 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2121

86. The rejection of claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 27, 34, 43, 45-46, 49 and 52-53 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) stand as set forth above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to position detection of wireless devices.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0055530 discloses an asset position detecting apparatus.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0258957 discloses a location system for locating and determining the motion and velocity of a wireless device.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0020278 discloses using changes in the sensed strength of radio signals at different location to determine a device's location.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0145688 discloses methods and apparatus for correlating physical and logical attributes of devices.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer L. Norton whose telephone number is 571-272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2121

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121